

REMARKS**01-05-2006 Telephonic Interview**

Applicant's attorney wishes to thank Examiner's Carter and Luebke for the opportunity to discuss this pending application on 01-05-2006. The discussion addressed the combining of claim 1 and claim 3 to overcome the 103 rejection based on Piper and Taniuchi in view of Ravier.

The pivoting function of Ravier was pointed out to be driven by a means independent of the light source movement. By contrast, Applicant's invention is directed to a device where the pivoting movement occurs as a result of the light source displacement.

SPE Luebke has suggested that claim 3 would be allowable if appropriate correction is made to reflect that the pivoting movement is tied to the light source displacement.

Discussion of Claim Amendments

The Examiner's objections with respect to claims 4 and 5 have been corrected. Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled. New claim 10 has been added which is identical to original claim 2 except that it depends from claim 3.

Claims 3, 4, 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Piper (1,543,617), Taniuchi (6,247,835), and Ravier (6,799,876). The Examiner states it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to use the pivoting system of Ravier in the headlight of Piper in view of Taniuchi, in order to allow rotational movement of the reflector and a stop means for the rotational movement.

The object of Ravier is to provide a lighting device with variable orientation along two axes, using only a single actuator. (Col. 1, lines 41-44). Additionally, the light source is inserted through lamp hole 12 and held in place. (Col. 3, lines 12-15). Thus Ravier teaches only a means to vary the orientation or pivot the lighting device while the light source is held in position.

By comparison, Applicant's invention allows pivoting the lighting device and adjustment of the light source relative to the reflector using a single electrical power means.

With respect to the obviousness issue, i.e. that Ravier can be combined with Piper and Taniuchi, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Ravier teaches that the light source is held in place. Thus, Ravier does not teach or infer that the light source can be adjusted relative to the reflector. Furthermore, there is no teaching or suggestion in Piper and Taniuchi that their means for displacement of the light source is capable of any other function.

In other words, even if the references could be properly combined, two separate means for mechanical movement are necessary. By way of example, Applicant describes pivot orientation in relation to movement of the light source toward or away from the reflector using a single servo motor 34. (Fig. 4).

Amended claim 3 now states, "whereby the focal access of the reflector is adjusted ... as the electrical power means moves the light source from the high beam position to the low beam position" is not taught or suggested by the prior art.

Since the references cited by the Examiner do not teach or suggest movement of the light source and pivoting action by a single electrical power means, Applicant believes the rejection based on obviousness has been overcome and that pending claims 3-10 are in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 10, 2006



Ralph D. Chabot, Reg. No. 39,133
Attorney for Applicant

CHABOT & ASSOCIATES
2310 E. Pondcrosa Drive, Suite 4
Camarillo, CA 93010-4747
(805) 388-5028